

REMARKS

Please reconsider the application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Applicants thank the Examiner for carefully considering this application and for the courtesies extended during the Examiner Interview conducted January 31, 2008.

Information Disclosure Statement

Applicants respectfully request the Examiner acknowledge and consider the references cited in the IDS being filed contemporaneously with this response.

Disposition of Claims

Claims 1-19 and 32-42 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 12, and 32 are independent. The remaining claims depend, directly or indirectly, from Claims 1, 12, and 32.

Drawings

Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to indicate in the next action whether the drawings filed on January 8, 2004 are acceptable.

Claim Amendments

Claims 1, 12, and 32 are amended to clarify various aspects of the invention. Further, claim 4 is amended for consistency with amended independent claim 1. No new matter is added by these amendments as support for the amendments may be found, for example, from page 23, line 20 to page 24, line 1; in Figure 4; and on page 29 at lines 1-6 and 21-24 of the specification.

Rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C § 103

MPEP § 2143 states that “[t]he key to supporting any rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 is the clear articulation of the reason(s) why the claimed invention would have been obvious. The Supreme Court in *KSR* noted that the analysis supporting a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 should be made explicit.” Further, when combining prior art elements, the Examiner “must articulate the following: (1) a finding that the prior art included each element claimed, although not necessarily in a single prior art reference, with the only difference between the claimed invention and the prior art being the lack of actual combination of the elements in a single prior art reference; ...” MPEP § 2143(A).

Claims 1, 3, 5-10, 12, 14, 16-18, 32, 34, and 36-41

Claims 1, 3, 5-10, 12, 14, 16-18, 32, 34, and 36-41 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,609,123 (“Cazemier”) in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0165724 (“Blanckesteijn”). To the extent that this rejection may still apply to the amended claims, the rejection is respectfully traversed.

Amended independent claim 1 recites, in part, that “said global attribute object model defines a first dependency between at least one attribute of said first data type and at least one attribute of a third data type ..., wherein said first dependency requires synchronization of said third data type with said data change” and that “said third data type is synchronized, as specified in said first dependency, with said data change in said modified attribute set.” Further, amended independent claim 1 requires, in part, that the data change is of the first data type on a first source system and that the third data type is on a third source system. In other words, amended independent claim 1 requires, in part, a global attribute object model that defines dependencies between attributes of data types that are associated with different source systems, where these

dependencies indicate which other data types should be synchronized in response to a data change of a given data type. More specifically, in claim 1, the dependencies in the recited global attribute model are used to *synchronize* a third data type on a third source system with a data change of a first data type occurring on a first source system.

In contrast, Cazemier teaches a *reporting* system that is capable of *extracting* data from various sources. See Cazemier, column 5 at lines 58-64. Further, Cazemier teaches that the query engine is configured to fulfill *requests* for information using metadata describing the various sources. See Cazemier, column 7 at lines 11-24. The metadata of Cazemier only determines the *source* of data to be retrieved and included in *reports*. See Cazemier, column 6 at lines 1-8. Accordingly, Cazemier fails to teach or suggest that the metadata defines dependencies that are used to *synchronize* one source system with data changes occurring on another source system. Thus, Cazemier does not teach or suggest a global attribute object model defining dependencies used in *synchronization* of data types as recited in amended independent claim 1.

Further, Blankesteijn does not teach that which Cazemier lacks. Blankesteijn teaches a system for updating data in business objects with data changes in source data objects. See Blankesteijn, paragraph [0042]. Further, Blankesteijn teaches that the data changes are published from the server to clients subscribed to the data changes. See Blankesteijn, paragraph [0095]. However, Blankesteijn fails to teach or suggest the use of a global attribute object model, or any equivalents, for synchronizing the business objects. Thus, Blankesteijn does not teach or suggest generating a global attribute object model defining dependencies for use in *synchronization* as recited in amended independent claim 1.

In view of the above, Cazemier and Blankesteijn, whether viewed separately or in combination, fail to render amended independent claim 1 obvious. Accordingly, claim 1 is

patentable over Cazemier and Blankesteyn for at least the reasons given above. Amended independent claims 12 and 32 includes the same patentable limitations as amended independent claim 1 and, thus, are patentable over Cazemier and Blankesteyn for at least the same reasons as amended independent claim 1. Dependent claims 3, 5-10, 14, 16-18, 34, and 36-41 depend, directly or indirectly, from claims 1, 12, and 32 and are patentable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 2, 4, 11, 13, 15, 19, 33, 35, and 42

Claims 2, 4, 11, 13, 15, 19, 33, 35, and 42 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cazemier in view of Blankesteyn and in further view of Examiner's Official Notice. To the extent the rejection may still apply to the amended claims, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

At the outset, the Applicants object to the Examiner's assertion that the limitations of claims 2, 13, and 33 would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill of the art. Specifically, the Examiner has failed to satisfy the requirements outlined in M.P.E.P. § 2144.03. This section of the M.P.E.P. requires that the Examiner only take Official Notice without documentary evidence "where the facts asserted to be well-known, or to be common knowledge in the art are capable of instant and unquestionable demonstration as being well-known." As noted by the court in *In re Ahlert*, 424 F.2d 1088, 1091, 165 USPQ 418, 420 (CCPA 1970), the notice of facts beyond the record which may be taken by the examiner must be "capable of such instant and unquestionable demonstration as to defy dispute" (citing *In re Knapp Monarch Co.*, 296 F.2d 230, 132 USPQ 6 (CCPA 1961)). In contrast to the above requirement, the Examiner has merely made an unsupported statement that the limitations in dependent claims 2, 13, and 33 would have been obvious to one skilled in the art. See Office Action mailed November 20, 2007, pages

5-6. It is not clear how the limitations in dependent claim 2, 13, and 33 are capable of instant and unquestionable demonstration as being well-known.

More specifically, a broadcast channel for *general* use by a source system may have been obvious to one skilled in the art; however, it is not necessary for the broadcast channel to be associated with a specific data type in order to effectively publish the data change as asserted by the Examiner. *See* Office Action mailed November 20, 2007, page 5-6. A general broadcast channel associated with *all data types* would be capable of effectively publishing the data change. Thus, Applicants assert that it would not have been obvious to one skilled in the art to use a broadcast channel associated with a specific source system and a *specific data type*. In view of the above, Applicants request that the Examiner provide evidence to support this position either in the form of prior art or by providing a declaration of personal knowledge pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.104 (d)(2).

Moreover, even assuming *arguendo* that the limitations of claims 2, 13, and 33 are well known in the field of the invention, as discussed above, Cazemier and Blankesteijn, whether viewed separately or in combination, fail to render amended independent claims 1, 12, and 32 obvious. Further, Examiner's Official Notice with respect to claims 2, 4, 11, 13, 15, 19, 33, 35, and 42 does not provide what Cazemier and Blankesteijn lack as the Examiner's Official Notice only recites using broadcast channels, forming the modified attribute set from local attributes, and using a transformation language compliant with XSLT and JAVA language syntax. *See* Office Action mailed November 20, 2007, at page 5-6.

In view of the above, Cazemier, Blankesteijn, and Examiner's Official Notice, whether considered separately or in combination, fail to render amended independent claims 1, 12, and 32 obvious. Dependent claims 2, 4, 11, 13, 15, 19, 33, 35, and 42 depend, directly or indirectly,

from claims 1, 12, and 32 and are patentable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Applicants believe this reply is fully responsive to all outstanding issues and places this application in condition for allowance. If this belief is incorrect, or other issues arise, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned or his associates at the telephone number listed below. Please apply any charges not covered, or any credits, to Deposit Account 50-0591 (Reference Number 03226/443001; SUN030034).

Dated: February 20, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By /Robert P. Lord/
Robert P. Lord
Registration No.: 46,479
OSHA · LIANG LLP
1221 McKinney St., Suite 2800
Houston, Texas 77010
(713) 228-8600
(713) 228-8778 (Fax)
Attorney for Applicants